

Attorney's Docket No.: 14580-040001

Remarks

The claims are amended herein. Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter similar to previous claim 2 but the column control input terminal is coupled to n (where $n \geq 2$) rather than two column select switches. Basis for the amendment can be found at page 11, lines 15 to 20. Claim 2 has been amended slightly to bring it into line with new claim 1. Claims 3 and 4 have not been amended. Claim 5 has been generalized to the row control input terminal being coupled to m (where $m \geq 2$) rather than two row select switches. Basis for this can be found at page 11, lines 15 to 20. Claim 6 has not been amended and claim 8 is a new claim based on previous claim 5, where m is two (i.e. analogous to claim 2 but rows rather than columns).

Claim 1 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Huang et al. The amendments made to claim 1 render claim 1 novel over Huang. In addition, it is submitted that claim 1 is inventive over the combination of Huang with Walczak, since Walczak is restricted to a two-connection (push-pull) arrangement - see Figure 2 - so does not disclose a more general arrangement in which each column control input terminal is coupled to n column select switches. Thus, to reach the claimed invention from Huang, the skilled person would need to combine Walczak with Huang and then extend the push-pull arrangement of Walczak to a n -connection arrangement. It is submitted that the skilled

Attorney's Docket No.: 14580-040001

person would not take such steps as there is no suggestion to do so in either of the documents. Thus, claims 1 to 6 and 8 are both novel and inventive over the cited documents.

Finally, at point 1 of the official action, the Examiner has objected that the "unique pair" feature of claim 6 is not shown in the drawings. However, this feature does seem to be shown in Figure 5. The specification is amended to clarify this.


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Attorney's Docket No.: 14580-040001

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply
any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 26, 2005



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10564531.doc